

(iii) was the statement mentioned in rule 6 as appended to notification really appended; was it published then or at any time,

(iv) if not, why was it not published at the time?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(a) Yes.

(ii) Category (a).

(iii) No. The statement was published in Kumbham and Karkadagam 1103.

(iv) Probably due to an oversight.

232. Mr. M. A. Chakko.—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(i) how far the ayacut published more than 2 years later in July 1928 (Karkadagam 1103) varied from the ayacut proposed to have been appended to the notification, dated 1st May 1926;

(ii) is the area detailed in the ayacut of the latter date July 1928 entirely covered by the area referred to as receiving customary demand in rule 7 of the notification, dated 1st May 1926;

(iii) if the answer is in the negative, will the Government be pleased to give in print a list of the lands that received the customary demand indicating also the crop season at which each of the plots is to get it?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(i), (ii) and (iii) The Member is referred to the notification and the two lists placed on the Council Table.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—About the supply of water to this land the ryots have made representations that the variation mentioned in (1) and (2) has been causing them inconvenience. Will the Government be pleased to say that that matter will be looked into?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Yes, it is being looked into.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—If revision is necessary, will it be undertaken?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Certainly.

233. Mr. M. A. Chakko.—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

if they are aware that Survey No. 238/1 is really a Mundakan land registered as such in the old ozhuku account, but by a mistake was entered as virippu in the settlement accounts, that nevertheless, mundakan crop continued to be raised in it all the time and that this mistake has given rise to so many complications?